

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.			
10/565,979	11/05/2007	Antoni Torrens Jover	283726US0PCT	9435			
OBLON SPIV	7590 12/16/200 7AK MCCI ELLAND	8 MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.	EXAM	IINER			
1940 DUKE S	TREET	O'DELL,	O'DELL, DAVID K				
ALEXANDRI	A, VA 22314	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER				
		1625					
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
			12/16/2008	ELECTRONIC			

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

### Application No. Applicant(s) 10/565,979 TORRENS JOVER ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit David K. O'Dell -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2006. 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 31-56 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-30 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some \* c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SZ/UE)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_\_.

Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

6) Other:

Notice of Informal Patent Application

Application/Control Number: 10/565,979 Page 2

Art Unit: 1625

### DETAILED ACTION

 This application is a 371 of PCT/EP04/08508 filed 07/29/2004, which claims priority to Espana P200301813 filed 07/30/2003

Claims 1-56 are pending.

#### 2. Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, Claims 1-24, 29-30 drawn to compounds and compositions. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed species of compound is also required. Further restriction based on the election may be made.

Group II, claims 25-28, drawn to methods of making the compounds of group I. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed species is also required. Further restriction based on the species election will be required.

PLEASE NOTE: Claims 31-56 are non-statutory use claims and are withdrawn from consideration. Cancellation is recommended

The inventions listed as Groups I-I do not relate to a single general inventive concept under 35 USC 121 or PCT Rule 13.1 because:

PCT Rule 13.1 states that the international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention").

PCT Rule 13.2 states that the unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features.

Annex B, Part 1(a), indicates that the application should relate to only one invention, of if there is more than one invention, inclusion is permitted if they are so slinked to form a single general inventive concept.

Art Unit: 1625

Annex B Part 1(b), indicates that "special technical features" means those technical features that as a whole define a contribution over the prior art.

Annex B Part 1(c), further defines independent and dependent claims. Unity of invention only is concerned in relation to independent claims. Dependent claims are defined as a claim that contains all the features of another claim and is in the same category as the other claim. The category of a claim refers to the classification of claims according to subject matter e.g. product, process, use, apparatus, means, etc.

Annex B Part I(e), indicates that the permissible combinations of different categories of claims. Part I(e)I, states that inclusion of an independent claim for a given product, an independent claim for a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an independent claim for a use of the said product is permissible.

Annex B, Part 1(f), indicates the "Markush practice" of alternatives in a single claim. Part 1(f), indicates the technical relationship and the same or corresponding special technical feature is considered to be met when (A) all alternatives have a common property or activity, and (B) a common structure is present or all alternatives belong to a recognized class of chemical compounds. Further defining (B), Annex B, Part 1(f)(i-iii), the common structure must; a) occupy a large portion of their structure, or b) the common structure constitutes a structurally distinctive portion, or c) where the structures are equivalent and therefore a recognized class of chemical compounds, each member could be substituted for one another with the same intended result. That is, with a common or equivalent structure, there is an expectation relationship and the corresponding special technical feature result from a common (or equivalent) structure that is responsible for the common activity (or property). Part 1(f) iv, indicates that when all alternatives of a Markush grouping can be differently classified, it shall no, take alone, be considered justification for finding a lack of unity. Part 1(f) iv, indicates that

"When dealing with alternatives, if it can be shown that at least *one* Markush alternative is not novel over the prior art, the question of unity of invention shall be reconsidered by the examiner"

In the instant case, at least one Markush alternative is not novel because prior art by WOO3/0100159 (cited on the IDS and ISR) teaches compounds of claim 1, as the Formula I (nage 3 where W is CO. X is CH2 and Y is NR):

Application/Control Number: 10/565,979 Page 4

Art Unit: 1625

## 5 Detailed description of the invention

The present invention relates therefore first to new carboxylic acid amide derivatives of formula (I)

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
V & & \\
V &$$

(1)

In the tables 5, & 6 shown below:

Table 5

Compounds of formula (1) prepared by procedure "B" described in Example 260
where X means -CH<sub>2</sub>- group, both of -(CHR<sup>1</sup>)<sub>m</sub>- and -(CHR<sup>2</sup>)<sub>c</sub>- are -CH<sub>2</sub>-CH<sub>2</sub>-groups Y, Z,

## 5 U and V are as given below:

	No.	V	U	Y	Z	MWe	MWf	k'	ĺ
- 1	1	4 4 3777	YY	CITY	**				

Art Unit: 1625

15.	4- HO-	H-	-CH <sub>2</sub> -	4-CH₃-	338.451	339.5	2.33
16.	4- HO-	H-	CH3-N<	4-C1-	373.884	374.4	1.369
17.	4- Ac-NH-	H-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CI-	414.937	415.4	1.785
18.	4- CH <sub>3</sub> -SO <sub>2</sub> -NH-	H-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Cl-	450.985	451.5	1.704
19.	4- CH <sub>3</sub> -SO <sub>2</sub> -NH-	H-	-CH <sub>2</sub> -CH <sub>2</sub> -	4-F-	433,542	434.3	2.504
20.	4- Ac-NH-	H-	-CH <sub>2</sub> -CH <sub>2</sub> -	4-F-	397.494	398.2	2.53
21.	4- HO-	H-	-CH <sub>2</sub> -CH <sub>2</sub> -	4-F-	356.441	357.2	2.325
22.	4- CH <sub>3</sub> -SO <sub>2</sub> -NH-	H-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	430.567	431.3	1.332
23.	4- Ac-NH-	H-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	394.519	395.3	1.433
24.	4- Ac-NH-	H-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-	459.388	460.2	1.864
25.	4- HO-	H-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-	418.335	419.2	1.461
26.	4- CH <sub>3</sub> -SO <sub>2</sub> -NH-	H-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-	495.436	496.3	1.793
27.	4- HO-	H-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	353.466	354.3	1.027

Table 6

Compounds of formula (I) prepared by procedure "B" described in Example 260
where X means -CH<sub>2</sub>- group, both of -(CHR<sup>1</sup>)<sub>8</sub>- and -(CHR<sup>2</sup>)<sub>5</sub>- are -CH<sub>2</sub>-CH<sub>2</sub>- groups, U
and V form together a bivalente group and Y and Z are as given below:

Art Unit: 1625

76.	3-4 -N=CH-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Cl-	397.91	398.5	1.296
77.	3-4 -O-CH <sub>2</sub> -CO-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CI-	428.92	429.5	1.896
78.	3-4 -S-C(SH)=N-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Cl-	447.015	447.5	2.285
79.	3-4 -NH-C(CH <sub>3</sub> )=N-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CI-	411.937	412.4	1.455
80.	3-4 -CH <sub>2</sub> -CH <sub>2</sub> -CO-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-C1-	426.948	427.4	1.937
	'		,	'	,	
82.	3-4 -O-CO-NH-	CH3-N<	4-C1-	414.893	415.5	1.827
83.	3-4 -CH=N-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Cl-	397.91	398.5	1.853
84.	3-4 -NH-N=CH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-C1-	397.91	398.5	1.932
85.	3-4 -CH=CH-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CI-	396.922	397.5	1.862
86.	3-4 -CH=C(CH <sub>3</sub> )-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CI-	410.949	411.4	2.130
87.	3-4 -S-CO-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-C1-	430.954	431.4	2.072
02.	3-4 -O-CO-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	394.475	395.2	1.467
03.	3-4 -NH-CO-O-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	394.475	395.2	1.48
04	3-4 -NH-CO-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	393.491	394.2	1.42

Application/Control Number: 10/565,979 Page 7

Art Unit: 1625

- 94 -

	,			····					-	
	3-4 -CH <sub>2</sub> -CO-NH	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -		392.503		393.3		1.444	
106.	3-4 -N=CH-NH-	CH3-N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	377.492		3	378.2		0.966	
107.	3-4 -O-CH <sub>2</sub> -CO-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	-	408.502		409.3		544	
108.	3-4 -CH=CH-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	376,504		377.2		1.453		
109.	3-4 -S-C(SH)=N-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	4	426.597		427.3		896	
110.	3-4 -CH <sub>2</sub> -CH <sub>2</sub> -CO-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	406.53		407.3		1.574		
111.	3-4 -NH-CS-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -		409.552		410.3		1,455	
112.	3-4 -S-CO-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -		4	10.3	1.	1.682	
113.	3-4 -CH=C(CH <sub>3</sub> )-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-		455.4		456.2		2.211	
114.	3-4 -NH-C(CH <sub>3</sub> )=N-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-	-	156.388	457.2		1.522		
115.	3-4 -CH <sub>2</sub> -CH <sub>2</sub> -CO-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-	-	171.399	472.8		2.001		
116.	3-4 -S-CO-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-	-4	475.405		476.2		2.159	
117.	3-4 -CH=C(CH <sub>3</sub> )-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	3	390,531		391.3		1.708	
118.	3-4 -CH=N-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	3	377.492		378.3		1.495	
119.	3-4 -NH-N=CH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	3	377.492		378.3		572	
120.	3-4 -O-CO-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-	-	159.344	4	60.2	1.	913	
,				. –					•	
121.	3-4 -CH <sub>2</sub> -CO-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-		457.372		458.2		1.839	
122.	3-4 -N=CH-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-		442.36	1 443.		.2 1.39		39
123.	3-4 -O-CH <sub>2</sub> -CO-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	CH <sub>3</sub> -N< 4-Br-		473.371		474.2		1.986	
124.	3-4 -NH-N=CH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-	442.36		1 443		.2 2.0		)23
125.	3-4 -CH=N-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-	4-Br- 442		51 443		2	1.949	
126.	3-4 -CH=CH-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-	4-Br-		441.373		2	1.953	
127.	3-4 -S-C(SH)=N-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-	4-Br-		491.466		.2	2.371	
128.	3-4 -NH-CS-NH-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-	- 474.42		1 475.		.2 1.89		397
129.	3-4 -NH-C(CH <sub>3</sub> )=N-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-CH <sub>3</sub> -	4-CH <sub>3</sub> - 391.5		9 392.		.3 1.1		51
130.	3-4 -NH-CO-O-	CH <sub>3</sub> -N<	4-Br-	4-Br- 45		459.344 460		2 1.9		809

At least where B is methyl, the only difference is the change of H to Methyl (recited as alkyl radical in the instant claims). This non-patentable distinction and makes it clear that applicants'

Art Unit: 1625

core is not a contribution over the prior art, thus the lack of a special technical feature is apparent.

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of making. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the method making the compounds can be practiced by a materially different process, such as the construction of the piperidine ring.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai; In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C.§ 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996).

Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include all the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01. Filing of appropriate terminal disclaimer in anticipation of a rejoinder may speed prosecution and the process of rejoinder.

Art Unit: 1625

3. In addition to the selection of an elected group applicant is required to elect a species. Claims 1-22, 25-30 are generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species: the compounds of claims 23-24. The species are independent or distinct because as disclosed the different species have mutually exclusive characteristics for each identified species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include

(i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement <u>may</u> be traversed (37

CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the

Art Unit: 1625

examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to David K. O'Dell whose telephone number is (571)272-9071. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30 A.M.-5:00 P.M EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Janet Andres can be reached on (571)272-0867. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DKO

/Rita J. Desai/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

Page 11

Art Unit: 1625